

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3 and 16 – 30 remain in the application and stand finally rejected. Claims 4 – 15 are previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 – 3 and 21 – 23 are amended by this proposed Amendment after final. Although this proposed Amendment after final is being timely filed, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required for this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Claims 1 – 3 and 21 – 23 are amended by this proposed Amendment to better recite the invention. This proposed Amendment is supported by the claims as finally rejected and by the specification. No new matter is added. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 16 – 23 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over published U.S. Patent application number 2002/0123983 to Riley et al. in view of published U.S. Patent application number 2003/0088456 to Ernest et al. Claims 2, 3 and 24 – 30 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Riley et al. and Ernest et al. further in view of U.S. Patent number 6370544 to Krebs et al. The final rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting both claims 1 and 2, the final Office action relies on Riley et al. “paragraph 0172, [to show that the] service desk may generate reports.” However, those reports are from customer satisfaction surveys taken after service is complete. For example, “[t]his can be achieved making use of subjective user perceptions of the Service Desk organization with the use of **customer** surveys.” Riley et al., paragraph 0155 (emphasis added). As provided in paragraph 0156 “[c]ustomer surveys can include questions similar to those listed” in paragraphs 0157 – 0170. More particularly, “[t]he service desk organization may commission **customer service surveys 161** and monitor defined service level statistics 162 to measure user satisfaction.” Paragraph 0172 (emphasis added). While customer service is important, it does not involve

technology applications 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, industry applications 31, 32, 33, and data warehouse 34.

Clearly, generating customer satisfaction survey reports is not “generating a report from said standard tables,” (i.e., “standard tables that contain information to be used to monitor and measure provided integrated services;”) as finally rejected claim 1 recites at lines 4 – 6; nor, “generating an integrated services report from said standard tables,” as claim 1 is amended to recite. Clearly also, this is not “generating reports based on said mapped data related to said categorized and/or resolved incidents,” as claim 2 is amended to recite.

So, regardless of whether, as the final Office action asserts, Paragraphs 0089-0090 of Ernest et al. discloses a “table in figure 2 [that] determines a business value (measure) and identifies each transaction of each service in which the respective component participates (monitors);” that does not change that Riley et al. teaches generating customer service response reports; and, that does not teach or suggest “generating an integrated services report from said standard tables,” instead. Therefore, combining Riley et al. with Ernest et al. does not result in the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Riley et al. and Ernest et al., as applied to claim 1, are further combined with Krebs et al. in finally rejecting claim 2. Specifically, Krebs et al. is relied upon to teach “using a bridge to map data from other host systems,” as further recited in claim 2. However, again, regardless of whether Krebs et al. teaches “using a bridge to map data from other host systems,” neither does that change that Riley et al. teaches generating customer service response reports; nor does it teach or suggest “generating reports based on said mapped data related to said categorized and/or resolved incidents,” instead. Therefore, combining Riley et al. and Ernest et al. with Krebs et al. does not result in the present invention as recited in claim 2.

Furthermore, ignoring *arguendo* that a customer satisfaction survey report is not “an integrated services report” or a report “based on said mapped data;” since Riley et al. teaches generating reports from customer satisfaction surveys, there is no reason one would be inclined

to generate those reports in real time or near real time as recited in claims 22, 23, 29 or 30. How quickly would customer satisfaction change and how reliable are a single customer's responses that near real time would be worthwhile? Not very! In fact a single disgruntled or difficult could produce unreliable real time results.

Moreover, dependent claims include all of the differences with the references, as the claims from which they depend. MPEP §2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)."). Therefore, Riley et al. and Ernest et al., alone, or further in combination with Krebs et al. fails to result in or teach the present invention as recited by claims 3 and 16 – 30, which depend from claims 1 and 2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 1 – 3 and 16 – 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The applicant has considered the other reference cited, but not relied upon and find it to be no more relevant than the references upon which the rejection is based.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the proposed amendment, reconsider and withdraw the final rejection of claims 1 – 3 and 16 – 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allow the application to issue.

The applicants have previously noted that MPEP §706 "Rejection of Claims," subsection III, "PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER DISCLOSED BUT NOT CLAIMED" provides in pertinent part that

If **the examiner** is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he or she **may note** in the Office action that **certain aspects or features** of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims **may be given favorable consideration**.

(emphasis added.) The applicants believe that the matter presented in the written description of

the present application is quite different than, and not suggested by, any reference of record. Accordingly, should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes.

Respectfully submitted,

November 30, 2007
(Date)

Francis Montgomery
Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3130